

**Document Type:** EIS-Administrative Record  
**Index Field:** Environmental Document Transmitted  
Public/Agencies  
**Project Name:** Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs  
Land Management Plan  
**Project Number:** 2008-30

## SCOPING DOCUMENT FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# **DOUGLAS AND NOLICHUCKY RESERVOIRS LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Cocke, Greene, Jefferson, and Sevier Counties, Tennessee**

**PREPARED BY:**  
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

DECEMBER 2008

Direct comments to:

Richard L. Toennisson  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
400 West Summit Hill Drive, WT 11D  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902  
Phone: (865) 632-8517  
Fax: (865) 632-3451  
E-mail: [rltoennisson@tva.gov](mailto:rltoennisson@tva.gov)

# **SCOPING DOCUMENT DOUGLAS AND NOLICHUCKY RESERVOIRS LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT DECEMBER 2008**

## **Introduction**

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) develops reservoir land management plans to facilitate the management of reservoir properties under its administration. In general, TVA manages public lands to protect and enhance natural resources, generate prosperity, and improve the quality of life in the Tennessee Valley. Plans are submitted to the TVA Board of Directors for approval. If approved these plans provide for long-term land stewardship and accomplishment of TVA responsibilities under the *TVA Act of 1933*.

TVA is preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS) to assess the potential environmental impacts of implementing individual reservoir land management plans for TVA-managed public property on two tributary reservoirs—Douglas and Nolichucky. The proposed land plans involve approximately 3,200 acres of federally owned TVA-managed public land. Under the Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs Land Management Plan (DNRLMP), properties would be allocated to various categories of uses. This allocation would then guide the types of activities to be considered on TVA-managed land. Land allocations will be based on public needs, the presence of sensitive environmental resources, TVA goals and policies, existing landrights, and other pertinent issues.

## **Background**

TVA originally acquired a total of about 3,750 acres in Cocke, Greene, Jefferson, and Sevier counties, Tennessee, above the normal summer pool of the two reservoirs. About 15 percent or approximately 550 acres of this land has subsequently been transferred or sold for economic, industrial, residential, public recreation, or natural resource conservation purposes. About two-thirds of the remaining land (approximately 2,100 acres) is on Douglas Reservoir, and one-third (approximately 1,100 acres) is on Nolichucky Reservoir. The approximately 3,200 acres remaining are managed by TVA and are the subject of the proposed reservoir land management plans.

Alternative land allocations will be analyzed as different alternatives in the EIS. In developing the land plan for each of the reservoirs, the lands currently committed to a specific use by deed, contract, or agreement will likely be allocated to that current use; however, changes that support TVA goals and objectives will be considered.

Douglas Reservoir was previously planned utilizing the Forecast System developed in 1965. Planned uses under the Forecast System included Dam Reservations, Public Recreation, Agriculture Research, Industry, Reservoir Operations, and Commercial Recreation. Under the Forecast System, the strip of land between the normal summer pool and a higher-contour elevation was not planned. TVA lands on Nolichucky Reservoir have never been planned.

In the planning process for the reservoirs, TVA would propose options for allocating its public lands into one of the categories shown in Table 1. The remaining lands that TVA does not own in fee, typically flowage easement lands, will be allocated to Zone 1 (Non-TVA Shoreland) and

are not included in this planning process. These zones are similar to those used on other TVA reservoirs that have been planned since 1999.

**Table 1. TVA Reservoir Land Planning Zones**

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Definition</b>
2 – Project Operations	TVA reservoir land currently used for TVA operations and public works projects.
3 – Sensitive Resource Management	Land managed for the protection and enhancement of sensitive resources.
4 – Natural Resource Conservation	Land managed for the enhancement of natural resources for human use and appreciation.
5 – Industrial	Land managed for economic development including businesses in distribution/processing/assembly and light manufacturing. Preference will be given for industries requiring water access.
6 – Developed Recreation	Land managed for public and/or commercial recreation.
7 – Shoreline Access	TVA-owned land where Section 26a applications and other land use approvals for shoreline alterations are considered.

In November 2006, the TVA Board of Directors approved the TVA Land Policy to govern the retention, disposal, and planning of interests in real property. This policy provides for the continued development of reservoir land management plans for reservoir properties with substantial public input and with approval of the TVA Board of Directors. The land use allocations will be determined with consideration of the social, economic, and environmental conditions around the reservoir. TVA will not allocate reservoir lands for residential use or dispose of reservoir properties for residential use. In addition, proposals for mixed-use development (live/work/play) will not be considered because of their residential component. For lands allocated as industrial, TVA will show a preference for water-based industries when disposing of land or landrights.

This EIS will tier from TVA's final EIS titled *Shoreline Management Initiative: An Assessment of Residential Shoreline Development Impacts in the Tennessee Valley*, which was issued in November 1998. This EIS addressed the potential environmental effects of various alternatives for managing residential shoreline development on its reservoirs. In its May 24, 1999, record of decision (ROD), TVA adopted the Blended Alternative identified in the *Shoreline Management Initiative* (SMI) EIS. Under the Blended Alternative, TVA sought to balance residential shoreline development, recreational use, and resource conservation needs in a way that maintains the quality of life and other important values provided by its reservoir system. In accordance with the TVA Shoreline Management Policy (SMP), which implements SMI, TVA will categorize the residential shoreline of Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs in response to permit requests. This will provide real-time information regarding the presence of sensitive species and their potential habitats, archaeological resources, and wetlands, which will result in accurate cumulative shoreline resources inventories meeting the intent of the SMP.

## Scoping Activities

TVA has sought extensive public involvement to help determine the scope of the EIS and to identify alternative allocations for the lands being planned. The major public involvement steps are listed below.

<u>May 30, 2008</u>	A notice of intent (NOI) was published in the <i>Federal Register</i> alerting other agencies and the public of the EIS.
<u>June 2, 2008</u>	Over 2,500 informational packages were mailed to stakeholder groups and individuals in the reservoirs' area.
<u>June 5, 2008</u>	An announcement of the June 12, 2008, public scoping meeting was published in six local newspapers: <i>Morristown Citizen Tribune</i> , <i>Jefferson City Standard Banner</i> , <i>Knoxville News-Sentinel</i> , <i>Sevierville Mountain Press</i> , <i>Newport Plain Talk</i> , and the <i>Greeneville Sun</i> .
<u>June/July 2008</u>	TVA staff met with stakeholder groups and individuals in the reservoirs' area to brief them on the planning effort.
<u>June 12, 2008</u>	A public scoping meeting was held at Walters State Community College in Morristown, Tennessee, and attended by 30 people.
<u>July 15, 2008</u>	A 46-day scoping comment period concluded with the receipt of comments from 118 commenters.

In addition, several newspaper articles and television news reports were published during the comment period by the local news media. During the 46-day public comment period, a toll-free telephone line was established for people to make verbal comments. Information about the proposed Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs Land Management Plan, including maps and an interactive comment form, was also available on the TVA Web site, <http://www.tva.gov/environment/reports/dnlp/index.htm>.

Copies of the NOI were sent to federal, state, and local agencies (see Table 2). Written comments were received from three federal agencies: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the U.S. Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (USOSM), and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Written comments were also received from the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) and the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA).

**Table 2. Agencies Sent a Copy of the Notice of Intent**

<b>Agency</b>
First Tennessee Development District
Great Smoky Mountains National Park
Tennessee Department of Agriculture
Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) TDEC - Division of Air Pollution Control TDEC - Division of Archaeology TDEC - Division of Recreation Educational Services TDEC - Division of Water Pollution Control TDEC - Natural Heritage Division TDEC - Tennessee Historical Commission
Tennessee Department of Transportation
Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Cookeville, Tennessee
U.S. Forest Service - Cherokee National Forest

The comments received during public scoping are summarized in the attached *Summary of Public Participation* issued in September 2008. The results of the public scoping provided recommendations on land use allocations for individual reservoirs and their parcels and on the environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS, as well as a characterization of respondents' use of the two reservoirs.

## **Alternatives**

TVA proposes to develop individual reservoir land management plans to guide land use approvals, private water use facility permitting, and resource management decisions on Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs. Under all of the Action Alternatives, the plans would identify land use zones in broad categories. Land currently committed to a specific use would be allocated to that current use unless there is an overriding need to change the use. This committed TVA land is most often reservoir land with existing TVA projects or existing land use agreements such as transfers, leases, licenses, contracts, power lines, outstanding landrights, and TVA-developed recreation areas.

The potential environmental effects of implementing a No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and two Action Alternatives as described in the following paragraphs will be evaluated in the DNRLMP EIS. The amount of land allocated for TVA Project Operations (Zone 2) and Shoreline Access (Zone 7) would likely remain the same under all the Action Alternatives. The proposed Action Alternatives are as follows: Alternative B – Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative and Alternative C – Modified Land Use Plan Alternative. Alternative B is based on the management of natural resources as proposed during scoping. Alternative C is a result of the public comments and other opportunities identified during scoping, and its implementation would lead to increased natural resource conservation and sensitive resource protection opportunities on public lands.

**Alternative A - No Action Alternative** - Under the No Action Alternative, TVA would continue to use the Forecast System designations established by TVA in 1965 to manage the lands surrounding Douglas Reservoir. Nolichucky Reservoir would remain unplanned. The lands with existing TVA projects and existing land use agreements surrounding the two reservoirs would not be allocated to a land use zone; therefore, complete alignment with existing TVA policies would not occur. Requested land uses on Douglas Reservoir that are consistent with the Forecast System designation could either be approved or denied based on a review of potential environmental impacts, TVA's Land Policy, and other administrative considerations.

**Alternative B - Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative** - Adoption of this alternative would promote conservation of natural resources. Under this alternative, TVA would create and implement individual land plans for the two reservoirs. The 3,200 acres of public land managed by TVA would be placed into one of the seven land use zones that best fits the existing land use. TVA would promote conservation of natural resources and project operations by allocating 30 percent of the land surrounding the two reservoirs to Natural Resource Conservation (Zone 4), 34 percent to Project Operations (Zone 2), 19 percent to Sensitive Resource Management (Zone 3), 16 percent to Developed Recreation (Zone 6), and less than 1 percent in Zones 5 and 7 combined. Exact acreages for each land use zone are not known at this time.

**Alternative C - Modified Land Use Plan Alternative** - Adoption of this alternative would provide additional opportunities for the conservation of natural resources with an emphasis on the management of sensitive resources. Under this alternative, TVA would create and implement individual land plans for Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs. The lands managed by TVA would be placed into land use zones that best represent the existing land use, public comments, and other opportunities identified during scoping. As compared to Alternative B, implementation of Alternative C would allocate more land to Sensitive Resource Management (Zone 3). TVA would allocate approximately 30 percent of the land surrounding the two reservoirs to Natural Resource Conservation (Zone 4), 34 percent to Project Operations (Zone 2), 22 percent to Sensitive Resource Management (Zone 3), and 14 percent to Developed Recreation (Zone 6). Exact acreages for each land use zone are not known at this time.

### **Significant Environmental Issues to be Addressed in Detail**

The majority of the public responses to the NOI focused on land ownership and rights on Nolichucky Reservoir. Many comments received raised issues regarding TVA's ownership of specific tracts of land. Stakeholders requested further investigation and information from TVA.

Additional comments were received expressing concerns about TVA's public notice. The stakeholders believed they were not properly informed about public meetings and that the comment deadline was unfair. Many urged TVA to extend the comment period because most of the landowners directly affected by the plan were not notified. There were many comments on allocating land for public access/use. Many stakeholders do not want to see the shoreline around and/or fronting their property opened up for public access because they believe it would cause an increase in trespassers on their property and would trigger other use issues. Other stakeholders stated that private landowners do not allow them to use public land, and they fear that public use of the shoreline of the Nolichucky Reservoir would not be allowed. Stakeholders

surrounding Nolichucky Reservoir commented on the amount of trash and litter, especially old tires, present along the shoreline.

The TWRA encouraged TVA to maintain the existing allocation of all lands currently committed to a specific use. Other stakeholders commented on the transferring of land to TWRA. A majority of these comments were against the transfer and stated that there had been past mismanagement and land ownership conflicts. The USFWS expressed the need to evaluate each alternative for impacts on the federally listed species that may occur in the project area.

### **Issues and Resources to be Addressed**

Based on the analysis of the scoping comments as well as its internal scoping, TVA has identified the following resources and issues that would be affected by implementing new land management plans for Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs. For each resource, the potential direct and indirect effects of each alternative will be described in the EIS. In addition, other activities that may affect resources of concern for land plans will be identified, and the potential effect of these activities on Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs' resources and trends in the resources will be assessed. The major resource categories that will be considered in the EIS are listed below.

**Land Use and Prime Farm Land** - Existing land use patterns on TVA-managed properties and back-lying land have been mainly determined by TVA land acquisition, disposals, and land use agreements. Many of the parcels are committed to existing land uses with little to no potential for change in the 10-year planning horizon. Proposed allocations of the remaining uncommitted parcels will be evaluated using the goals of the DNRLMP and TVA policies and regulations. Prime farmland as defined in the *1981 Farmland Protection Policy Act* is an important resource; its occurrence will be identified on TVA-managed public land, and the effects of the implementation of each alternative will be evaluated.

**Recreation** - Current recreation facilities available to meet public recreation needs will be identified, as will those lands that are important for consumptive and nonconsumptive dispersed recreation. The effects of implementing each alternative on recreation opportunities in the vicinity of Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs will be evaluated.

**Terrestrial Ecology** - This category includes the plants and animals comprising the terrestrial ecosystems and communities found adjacent to the reservoirs, including the control of invasive species. Issues include the identification and protection of significant natural features, rare species' habitat, migratory birds, important wildlife habitat, and locally uncommon natural community types.

**Endangered and Threatened Species** - State or federally listed threatened and endangered plant and animals are known or likely to exist in the vicinity of Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs. These species will be identified, including their occurrence and habitats on TVA lands and waters, and the effects of implementing each alternative will be evaluated, including compliance with the *Endangered Species Act* (ESA) and similar state laws.

**Wetlands** - Wetlands are important to terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. Those found on TVA land and along the reservoir shoreline will be identified, and the effects of

implementing each alternative will be evaluated, including compliance with Executive Order (EO) 11990 on wetlands and the *Clean Water Act*.

**Floodplains** - Floodplains are important to flood control and water quality issues and are productive natural areas. Those found on TVA land and along the reservoir shoreline will be identified, and the effects of implementing each alternative will be evaluated, including compliance with EO 11988 on floodplains.

**Cultural and Historic Resources** - Archaeological sites, historic buildings, and cultural landscapes and properties on or near the reservoirs lands including sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) will be identified, and the effects of implementing each alternative will be evaluated, including compliance with the *National Historic Preservation Act*.

**Managed Areas and Sensitive Ecological Sites** - TVA will identify special and unique natural areas on or in the vicinity of the reservoirs set aside for a particular management objective and lands that are known to contain sensitive biological, cultural, or scenic resources. The effects of implementing each alternative will be evaluated.

**Aesthetics and Visual Resources** - The aesthetic setting of the reservoir will be characterized, and scenic and distinctive areas frequently seen by reservoir users and adjacent reservoir residents will be identified. The effect of each alternative on the natural beauty of the shoreline will be evaluated.

**Water Quality** - Water quality conditions affect the overall ecological health of Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs. Water quality is influenced by activities causing shoreline erosion as well as pollution, litter, and debris control. The effect of implementing each alternative on water quality will be evaluated.

**Aquatic Ecology** - Aquatic ecology includes the plants and animals found in the waters of Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs, their tributaries, and their tailwaters. Issues that will be evaluated include the identification and protection of rare species' habitat, important aquatic habitat, or locally uncommon aquatic community types. The effect of implementing each alternative on aquatic ecology will be evaluated.

**Air Quality and Noise** - Both resources are important for public health and welfare. The effect of implementing each alternative with National Ambient Air Quality Standards, which establish safe concentration limits of various air pollutants, is an important issue that will be identified and discussed.

**Socioeconomics** - The current population, labor force, employment statistics, income, and property values of the reservoirs' region will be described. A subset of these issues is environmental justice, the potential for disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income communities. The potential socioeconomic effects of adopting and implementing each alternative will be evaluated.



## **Issues and Resources Not to be Addressed**

Based on the analysis of the scoping information, TVA has identified that the development of the land plans is unlikely to have an impact on greenhouse gases. No sequestered carbon would be released to the environment under any of the alternatives.

Some comments submitted during scoping dealt with lake levels. These comments have been previously addressed in TVA's 2004 *Reservoir Operations Study*. Comments pertaining to lake levels are not within the scope of this EIS. Rather, these comments and other nonenvironmental issues, such as appreciation or critiques of TVA processes and guidelines, will be forwarded to TVA's Office of Environment and Research for attention, and will not be addressed further in this environmental review.

TVA will evaluate the potential impacts from the implementation of the land plans as valid projects are identified.

## **Related Environmental Documents**

### *Shoreline Management Initiative: An Assessment of Residential Shoreline Development Impacts in the Tennessee Valley Final Environmental Impact Statement (TVA 1998) (SMI EIS)*

In 1998, TVA completed an EIS that analyzed possible alternatives for managing residential shoreline development throughout the Tennessee River Valley. The alternative selected determined TVA's current SMP. The SMP incorporates a strategy of maintaining and gaining public shoreline through an integrated approach that conserves, protects, and enhances shoreline resources and public use opportunities, while providing for reasonable and compatible use of the shoreline by adjacent landowners. The SMP defines the standards for vegetation management, docks, shoreline stabilization, and other residential shoreline alterations. The DNRLMP EIS will tier from the SMI EIS.

### *Reservoir Operations Study Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (TVA 2004)*

This EIS describes the evaluation of several possible alternatives for managing TVA's water operations. It includes Douglas and Nolichucky reservoirs and management of their seasonal water levels.

### *Nolichucky Reservoir Flood Remediation Final Environmental Impact Statement (TVA 2007)*

On April 13, 2007, TVA issued the ROD for this project to evaluate alternative ways to address flooding effects of Nolichucky Dam and the accumulated sediment in Nolichucky Reservoir on land and property not owned by the federal government. The ROD was published in the *Federal Register* on April 19, 2007.

### *Nolichucky Sand Company Bird Bridge Dredge Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment (TVA 2004)*

TVA, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and TDEC authorized a dredge operation following the completion of an environmental assessment (EA) in August 1999. In June 2003, new owners, Vulcan Materials Inc., proposed to expand its existing commercial sand dredging operation upstream for nearly an additional mile above Bird Bridge. TVA and USACE jointly prepared a supplemental EA to analyze the environmental impacts of additional proposed dredging and the renewal of TVA land use, TVA Section 26a, and USACE Section 10 approvals.

*Cherokee Valley Subdivision Final Environmental Assessment (TVA 2007)*

In January 2007, TVA issued a final EA and finding of no significant impact (FONSI) for Mountain Ridge LLC's proposed Cherokee Valley Subdivision near Sevierville. Construction of various structures in the floodplain of Lost Branch and Walden Creek requires TVA Section 26a approval. TVA's EA focused on potential impacts to floodplains and historic properties.

*Pigeon Falls Lane Stream Modifications Final Environmental Assessment (USACE 2008)*

In July 2008, TVA issued a FONSI for the issuance of Section 26a approval of construction of Pigeon Falls Lane in the City of Pigeon Forge, Sevier County, Tennessee. The City of Pigeon Forge proposed to construct a 0.5-mile road to provide access to the proposed Pigeon Falls Village and other future developments. This road would also serve as a regional connector. The road construction would result in the filling of about 1,400 linear feet of two streams to the West Prong of the Little Pigeon River. TVA cooperated with the USACE in the preparation of an EA of the proposed action. TVA has adopted this EA.

*Eagle's Landing Golf Course Expansion Final Environmental Assessment (TVA 2008)*

In April 2008, TVA issued a FONSI and a final EA for Section 26a approval of the construction of bridges and placement of fill in a floodplain associated with the expansion of the Eagle's Landing Golf Course in Sevierville, Sevier County, Tennessee. The City of Sevierville Public Building Authority proposed to expand the golf course onto Sanders Islands in the Little Pigeon River at River Mile 2.4. The bridges and fill, as well as the associated construction of underground utilities, require approval by TVA under Section 26a of the *TVA Act*. TVA issued the Section 26a approval on April 30, 2008.

### **Other Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements**

TVA will be the lead federal agency in the preparation of the land plans and EIS. Other environmental and permitting agencies, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, USACE, USFS, U.S. Geological Survey, TDEC, Tennessee State Historic Preservation Office, and TWRA will be sent a copy of the draft EIS for review.

### **Delegation of Work Assignments**

Office of Environment and Research, Environmental Services and Programs, NEPA Resources, will have primary responsibility for management of the EIS process and assembly of the draft and final EIS, in consultation with Land and Water Stewardship and the Office of the General Counsel. Other TVA groups, including Environmental Research and Technical Services, River Operations, and Economic Development, may contribute to the analysis.

### **Interdisciplinary Team**

The following TVA staff individuals are potentially participating in preparation of the EIS. Their respective responsibilities for the individual resource area discussions are also denoted. Other personnel may also participate as needed.

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Resource Area</b>
Tyler Baker	Surface Water and Water Quality
Michael Broder	Air Quality
Chris Cooper and Dana Vaughn	Project Managers
Pat Cox	Botany and Endangered and Threatened Plants
Janice Dockery	Document Editor
Jim Eblen	Socioeconomics
Jerry Fouse	Project Advisor and Recreation
Kenneth Gardner	Aquatic Ecology and Endangered and Threatened Aquatic Animals
Kelie Hammond	Navigation
Hill Henry	Terrestrial Ecology and Endangered and Threatened Terrestrial Animals
Clint Jones	Aquatic Ecology and Endangered and Threatened Aquatic Animals
Alan Mays	Prime Farmland
Mark McNeely	Graphics
Johnathan McNutt	Recreation
Roger Milstead	Floodplains and River Operations
Aurora Moldovanyi	Recreation
Chett Peebles	Cultural Resources – Historic Structures and Visual Resources
Kim Pilarski-Brand	Wetlands
Laura Smith	Communications
Jan Thomas	Natural Areas
Rick Toennisson	NEPA Project Management
Dana Vaughn	Land Use and Watershed Initiatives
Ted Wells	Cultural Resources – Archaeology

### **Schedule for Draft EIS Preparation and Review**

The following is a tentative schedule for the completion of the EIS.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Date</b>
Draft EIS Notice of Availability (NOA)	September 2009
Public review of draft EIS	September-October 2009
Development of final EIS	November 2009-January 2010
Final EIS NOA	February 2010
Consideration by TVA Board of Directors	April 2010
ROD NOA	May 2010

# **Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs Land Management Plan**

## **Summary of Public Participation**

---

*Tennessee Valley Authority*

September 2008

Page intentionally blank

## Part I:

### Public Comments Identified by Issue

#### Abbreviations for Government Agencies and Stakeholder Groups

TDOT	Tennessee Department of Transportation
TWRA	Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
USOSM	U.S. Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Land Ownership and Rights	
<b>Ownership</b>	
As homeowners along the Nolichucky River, specifically K3 and K4 on your map (in the red zone), Title parcel A3, we disagree with TVA taking our land and making another unnecessary boat ramp. We are not uneducated citizens; we are all for progress and for the good of many. However, we purchased a great deal of land in the County to have our privacy, to enjoy this natural environment.	Individuals (2)
Should we now turn to our local government for tax refunds or do you take any responsibility? What is your liability for individuals that find their way onto my land from the river bank you claim to own? That river bank that I have strived to protect from pollution and disturbance in an effort to maintain the fragile balance of nature. Are the title companies now in the mix of confusion and misinformation as it related to title searches? Are real estate brokers affected by their past sales to buyers who were under the false impression of ownership?	Individual
I learned by reading today's edition of the Greeneville Sun newspaper that you are planning to take over my property as well as the property of my neighboring landowners as if you owned the land that I just paid for about a year ago. There is no legal notice in my deed that you or anyone else has an easement or ownership of my land other than me. I have not received any notice from your office that you plan to do anything with my land. It has been my experience in Georgia, Washington, Oregon, and now Tennessee that local, state, and federal governments treat their citizens as worthless trash with no property rights. I don't know when this became Russia instead of the USA, but apparently the government agencies in this country think they rule by divine right and no one else has any rights whatsoever. I am considered good enough to pay megabucks in property taxes. What is the point of paying property taxes if TVA is just going to steal my property from me whenever they decide to?	Individual
Ensure that land owners with long time deeds to the middle of the river have their land protected from intrusion by the public. Ownership of lands needs to be clear as does liabilities and responsibilities.	Individual

I have been under the impression that I have owned the property adjoining Parcel 13 on Map B7. I have paid property taxes on it for over 10 years. My brother and I have managed the property adjacent to this parcel for wildlife and forestry. We have invested in food plots located near this parcel. We have had several instances of poaching and trespassers from this parcel. It is my opinion that this parcel is too small and sensitive for any use by the public.	Individual
The deed for our land calls for the property line to go to the river. TVA would be controlling many acres of land that have been bought and paid for by someone else (not to mention the payment of land taxes). TVA would be sitting in some office far away while we are contending with the problem that comes with strangers who neither love nor respect your land.	Individual
The suggestion that TVA owns and/or controls land upon which property taxes have been privately paid for for generations, and without regard to the huge investments private citizens have made to improve such property, has regional anti-eminant domain warriors on the rampage. I cannot imagine why TVA would want to bring this commotion down on itself. The legal, political and financial implications are enormous and portend significant, contentious conflicts between TVA and not only numbers of outraged private property owners, real estate brokers and title firms, but also with tax-assessing-and-collecting bodies within which property TVA says it owns is located.	Individuals (2)
I have also been informed that representatives of the TVA or related agencies have been systematically trespassing on my property in an effort to gain access to this parcel of land. We have witnessed vehicles appearing to display government issued plates trespassing over my land to travel on a private path across private property. I am very concerned with the actions of the TVA in this matter. Some of these actions cause fear, others doubt and mistrust, and overall give the whole Federal Government a bad reputation for trying to work within the law and concern for all citizens.	Individuals (2)
It was with great dismay that I recently learned of a plan to make public some lands that, while not directly connected with my property, open my property up to potentially more public activity - as well as the introduction of a negative environmental impact to a native Huron near my property (upstream of this proposal), and the character and landscape of the area. It was my understanding that the property in question (as I understand it identified, Nolichucky parcel A3) is owned by landowners in the area who paid for this property when acquiring a total parcel of land. This purchase was pursuant to the understanding that this riverfront land was included in the purchase. The ownership of this land by private citizens influenced my decision to invest in the property I now own, as I did not want public access near my property, both by accident and intent. It is now my understanding that the TVA is claiming rights of ownership to this land, and wishes to open it to public access.	Individual
The legal description of my property deed is Tract 20 of the Ed Wills Farm in the 9th Civil District of Greene County, Tennessee a plat of which is found of record in Plat Cabinet A, Slide 275, Register's Office for Greene County, Tennessee. I have also been informed; representatives of the TVA or related agencies have been systematically trespassing on my property in an effort to gain access to this parcel of land. We have witnessed vehicles appearing to display government issued plates trespassing over my land to travel on a private path across private property. I am very concerned with the actions of the TVA in this matter. Some of these actions cause fear, others doubt and mistrust, and	Individual

overall give the whole Federal Government a bad reputation for trying to work within the law and concern for all citizens.	
There are significant legal questions about property rights here, not to mention liability and further environmental damage from future uses of this watershed.	Individual
The deed problem is a big one here, as the deeds office is in the dark. Therefore, your claims are at a high risk until this is sorted out further and grave reason to extend your public comment period. These deeds must be addressed before you plow on with your management plans. Our deeds conflict with your assertions. TVA claims they inherited all this property. Alas, that information has not transferred to individual deeds. This presents a serious legal challenge which must be resolved.	Individuals (3)
I am a real estate agent in Greeneville, Tennessee. I need clarification on deeds regarding TVA ownership along the Nolichucky River in and around Greeneville as I must properly present this information to clients as well as protect my business reputation.	Individual
The WMA was created in the early 1970's out the decision to shut down the Nolichucky Hydro Plant. It had a number of goals among them was the creation of a resident Canada Goose flock of 300 birds and a resident Wood Duck flock of 1000 birds within 5 years of project completion. To accomplish these goals, several tracts of adjoining land were acquired, by condemnation, when necessary. The scheme was to create share croppers out of the former landowners. The tract taken from my family was leased to a number of people. The WMA has existed for over thirty years and none of the goals have been accomplished. There are now about 30-60 Canada Geese and no Wood Ducks to speak of. Almost all of the sharecroppers went broke. The land formerly owned by my family is now in nuisance vegetation as a result of government neglect. At this point in time, logic would dictate that the present WMA is a failure. Legal agreements can be amended or terminated by consent of all parties. There is no reason why wildlife management can't occur on privately-owned land. In fact it is being done under the Conservation Reserve Program. TVA can do what it will with the dam and reservoir but all other tracts on the map need to be put back in the hands of the former landowners.	Individual
My property is on Map A3 as parcels K4 and K3. This land is owned by my family who acquired the land many years ago. This purchase was pursuant to the understanding that this riverfront land was included in the purchase. The ownership of this land influenced my decision to invest in the property (approximately 200 acres) I now own and would have a very large impact on my property. I have a warranty deed, clear title opinion and title insurance. According to the map I was shown, it is now my understanding that the TVA is claiming rights of ownership to this land to which I have a deed, title insurance and surveys. Incidentally, I paid a premium for this land due to the river access.	Individual
We own Lot #9 & Lot # 10 at Riverview Estates along West Allens Bridge Road. We are opposed to TVA's proposed action plan to take possession of any portion of our property. We purchased this property in its entirety and have paid the Real Estate taxes on it annually as required, in addition to it maintenance. We consider this proposed action plan by TVA an injustice to any landowner who has purchased river front property.	Individuals (2)
I own about 500 acres with 3 miles of River. I have invested large sums to develop the property habitat to be a haven for wildlife. We are now home to a wide number of TN wildlife including herons, eagles, fox, beaver, quail Bob cat,	Individual



cougar bear and turkey and of course 3 breeds of deer. To preserve this habitat and this effort should it prove that in fact I do not own the portions I believe I do I would request that either that 3 miles be classified as sensitive or that TVA purchase the whole property at the current value of 13 million.	
The proposed actions that are being discussed would invade the privacy and well-being, including the safety of myself and family. To open access across my property could result in major problems with unruly, drunks, drug addicts and dangerous people that could be a threat to this community.	Individual
I do have a problem with anyone saying that I don't have the right to take my canoe down the river and getting out anywhere I want to go fishing. I don't believe a property owner should be able to own the river's right-of-way. You can't own a river.	Individual
As far as public/private property is concerned, the public needs to be made clearly aware of who owns what. Years ago, (when I could still get access there) I was standing in the water near Earnest Bridge with my young son when a landowner walked up and said we were trespassing and to leave. For years I did not believe he was right. Recently an acquaintance of mine spoke with a TWRA official who agreed with the landowner's position. It seems TWRA always strives to please the landowners instead of the public (to which the waters belong).	Individual
<b>Access to Public Land</b>	
The landowners who own property joining TVA lands think they own to the water's edge or to the center of the river. I have a copy of the maps that clearly show which part belongs to the TVA and where private land is owned. I have been threatened on several occasions and told that I cannot hunt there.	Individual
I know when I was young and coming up, you could cool anywhere along the Nolichucky River and everybody said TVA owned all the high water marks and all these people from the North came down and bought the land and said they owned every bit of it including the river. I wanted to know if that was the law or the old people's law?	Individual
It's my fear as a sportsman and one who lives near and utilizes the waterway for recreational purposes that, if allowed, private landowners will deny public access to public land along the river and lake. I understand the landowners' fears and concerns about a few people unlawfully accessing their land and property from the TVA land along river, however this is one of the aspects and drawbacks of owning land along a public waterway. Most people who raft, canoe, swim, fish, and camp along the river are law abiding citizens. Please do no limit access to our natural resources because of the acts of a few people. It is the landowner responsibility to secure their property lines and report all misdeeds and unlawful acts by others to the authorities; therefore I feel that the property owners have the right to limit access across their property to the river	Individuals (2)
There is not a public access road from the county road through our property nor will there be.	Individuals (2)
I have a lot of concerns that if the TVA opens that up to public access and stuff, that, one, it would open up a lot of people coming to visit in from different areas and put a lot of people in jeopardy that owns land around it. It would kill natural resources of the river they way the settings are right now.	Individual

I would love to see more access given to recreation on the river. Years ago I was able to access the river at Earnest Bridge; since then, the access there has been removed. Also, I think access at Allens Bridge is needed. From the access at the dam to Allens Bridge is my favorite section to float.	Individual
My family feels the public needs more access to the Nolichucky River and more public areas along the river in order to become more familiar with and appreciate the treasures and wonders of the State's natural and scenic waterways. I think if more people saw first hand the amazing and delicate River, fewer people would be so willing to do things to impact the natural world negatively.	Individual
A little more public access on the river is ok, but it should be left somewhat remote and challenging to get to as well.	Individuals (2)
I can remember growing up fishing the Nolichucky river, at many locations in Greene County, but as time goes on it has become less accessible. I would love to give my children the same opportunities I had, but it is just is not so any more. There are very few places people can access the river at a safe location being disabled now makes it even more of an issue. I am not sure what the plan is in detail, but I would be one of the grateful anglers in East Tennessee that would love to have more access to our resource's, how are we to teach our children the important things of wild life if they can not observe them, or interact with them.	Individual
Develop public access points at logical locations. There should be developed access points with parking lots and concrete boat ramps at various locations along the river. Jones Bridge and Kinser Bridge would be good starting points. It does belong to the public and should be accessible whether the adjacent land owners like it or not.	Individual
The roads to get to any portion of A3 are narrow and off the beaten track. The roads are not wide enough for two cars to pass, not to mention a boat or camper. The only way to enter these portions of the river via Gray Road and Pumpkin Bloom Road. We realize that most of the investigating on the part of the TVA has been done by river travel, have you checked the road access?	Individuals (4)
The right of way is only 20 feet wide, washed out and abandoned. How would this problem be resolved to meet current specs for public road widths and what effects would it have on the rest of my property? As a suggestion maybe an option to this major disruption, would be access points at all bridges crossing the Nolichucky. This would be accommodating to the public and to the property owners. Also it could be more feasible to maintain both law and order including sanitary issues.	Individuals (2)

With this in mind here are my recommendations regarding managed land use for recreation purposes: 1. To protect the private landowners, TVA should not build public access roads, walkways, paths, boat ramps, etc. on or across privately owned property for public to access to TVA managed land, unless TVA has obtained the private landowner's permission, and/or with just compensation to the private landowner for the land acquired for public access. 2. Public access to TVA managed land should be protected and maintained through utilization of existing public access sites and, when economically feasible, the develop public access sites in coordination and in conjunction with TRWA and local governments, as applicable. TVA purchase of private land for public access to TVA managed land would be a wasteful use of resources; therefore public access should occur across government owned land (municipal, county, state, and federal) whenever possible. 3. Private landowners should not be allowed to limit public access to TVA managed lands from riverside access, example; placing "No Trespassing" signs along the river or lake bank preventing access for people to get out of their boats, rafts, to rest or set up a camp site	Individual
I have heard landowners talking about how much trash is left behind by boaters/fishermen as their reasoning for wanting no more access given, and I have seen far more damage done by landowners than by the boaters (barbed wire fencing and dead livestock in the waters, dumping sites and direct drains from homes adjacent to waters, etc).	Individual
<b>Trespassing</b>	
I don't want anyone stepping foot on my land from the river or the road without my permission.	Individuals (2)
A small portion of my property does front on the river; however, it's a bluff, but my neighbor has property that I understand is a three-acre plat that is in dispute as to whether TVA owns it or not. That actually is in the corner of my property and it is a low walk-on area to the river. I have had problems in the past of people coming on to my property and then poaching deer on my property. I have actually talked to the wildlife people about this but have not gotten any results or any help in trying to eliminate that. Actually I would like to talk to someone to, at least, voice my concerns about the fact that hunting or because of people allowed on the property what they would do on my property even though it will be posted.	Individuals (3)
We are concerned about the creation of walking trails and rafting companies that pass our property because of the allure of our property. The property is inviting for rafters because of the ease of access to the river and the mounds of sand trapped inside our levies. Trespasser safety around the levies has continued to be a problem. We have posted no trespassing signs throughout the property but, rafters continue to take chances scaling the levies. We are fearful that trespassing will increase if rafters are encouraged to explore down the river past our property with out public warning. We hope that TVA's actions will be responsible to the public by making them aware of possible hazards and that trespassing is not tolerated.	Individual
It is a struggle to keep trespassers off the land. It is posted but not all of the general public abides by the rules. Your plans to use the Nolichucky River in our area for recreational purposes is only going to increase the number of trespassers we encounter, add to the litter they leave behind, and open up huge legal liability for us in regards to people who may become injured on our property.	Individual

Land Plans	
<b>Land Planning</b>	
Why use the resources “money” on this kind of project.	Individual
I understand TVA is doing this by watershed, however, Nolichucky is very different. I need for TVA to separate out our unique set of circumstances and get that lake talk out of our plan.	Individual
All usage plans should give top priority to environmental concerns first, and public recreation/history second.	Individual
The introduction of the TVA Land Management Plan opens this river up to potential rapid development: residential, industrial, and recreational. Much of this development would be a drastic change from the peaceful way of life that now exists. An increase in population brings additional stresses to the land, to the water and to people. I do not want this to happen.	Individual
Under Zone 5, TVA lists fleeting areas, barge terminal sites etc. These are clearly for lake access and lake properties and I request all such zoning be separated out so that the people do not misunderstand they are a river and cannot be lumped in with what is happening on Douglas Lake or Norris or any other. We are not a lake we are a small river. Our issues for best management of the land are quite different from that of a lake, obviously. Yet this is not made specific in your proposal. Specifically in your proposal is lacking altogether. It is all too vague and as one mountaineer commented yesterday. “You would like us to comment on ghosts?” We need much clearer information designed for our region.	Individual
Greene County needs to put zoning in place to prevent development on the edges of the river to protect what is so special about our waterfront as a natural environment.	Individual
I have looked at the maps for the Nolichucky Reservoir Land Management Plan and have a few questions. Are the areas marked in red (Zone 6) the only areas being considered for this Plan? If a portion of the land adjoining the river is not marked with a parcel number, am I correct in assuming these are Zoned 1 and will not be affected by this Land Management Plan? If so, does TVA only have flowage easements on these lands?	Individual
My land abuts the lake immediately downstream of Birds Bridge and part of it is leased to Vulcan Materials for its dredging operation. It also abuts part of the so-called Nolichucky Wildlife Management Area (WMA). Not knowing what, if any, proposed action TVA might have in mind, I can only comment on the territory immediately around me. Additionally, I've been told that, for legal reasons, there is no proposed action involving the WMA. There is an agreement with the TWRA. Nonetheless, it is considered part of the plan. It's on the map.	Individual
If I am even correct about where my property is on your plan, I am blue and turquoise. Then why would there be development lines slashing through these colors? Why would TVA propose to develop an area with sensitive resources?	Individual
I own a farm at the mouth of Coal Creek about a mile and one half below the Greeneville Power Dam. I am wondering how, if any, this plan affects me.	Individual

<b>Land Use Designation and Allocations</b>	
Again, we want to express our input that the areas K3-K6 be changed to zone 3 or 4 instead of 6 for the following reasons: 1. There is a cave which opens over the river on parcel K5. This cave houses thousands of bats which would be disturbed were this area to be used as recreation. 2. American Black Vultures roost all along parcels K5 and K6 daily and have nest down river. 3. Numerous Blue Herron nest are on the island designated as K5. This island is less than 10 acres, so it should ,by your own guidelines, be classified as Zone 4, notwithstanding the habitat of the Blue Herron and other native creatures. Let's protect our natural habitat along the river and in 100 years we will be able to look back and say we did the right thing.	Individuals (8)
I own property that adjoins parcel 13 on map B7. Parcel 13 is currently zoned as type 4 and should be rezoned as a type 3. This parcel contains a year round spring. The terrain of the area and soil type are such that any disturbance would cause runoff and siltation that would be detrimental to the plant and animal life in this area. The area has a protected turkey roosting area, many nesting sights for numerous bird species, and may contain an Native American burial mound. The University of Tennessee conducted an archeological survey and dig near this area and found a significant amount of artifacts. This is an extremely delicate and sensitive parcel and should have limited human trespass.	Individual
As a concerned citizen, I feel the land management plan for the Nolichucky Reservoir should be modified near the convergence of Horse Creek and the Nolichucky River in Greene County and coded as Sensitive Resource Management (Zone 3) because: 1) The Nolichucky Watershed/Green County needs better protected resources. 2) In this specific area, the southern banks of the Nolichucky are home to many types of wildlife including many species of Sparrows and sensitive wetland species that deserve protection. 3) Usage in this area should be limited to prevent erosion, run-off, and water quality issues on the Nolichucky. Please consider rezoning the area of the Nolichucky River between Highway 351 and 107 to reflect the proper Land Management Plan needed for the flora and fauna in the local habitat.	Individuals (2)
We request that parcel K6 on the Reservoir Map Title A# be rezoned from Zone 6 to Zone 4 or if possible Zone 3 for the following reasons: There are river otter and beaver living in the river along this section. A couple of minks were recently spotted. We have fresh water mussels which we understand are nowhere else in East TN. The island (known as Gray Island) as well as the shoreline of our property is a nesting place for the black vulture, the turkey buzzard and several nest of Blue herons, an eagle, ospry, red tailed hawk, and large woodpeckers are often spotted here. Some of these birds are on the endangered list. We have lived on this property for 25 years and have made every effort to preserve the habitat for the birds and other wild life that share our property. We feel the development of this property for public recreation will be a mistake for many generations to come. We would like our grandchildren to be able to come and enjoy the wonders of nature Please consider our request of rezoning this property from Zone 6 to Zone 3.	Individuals (2)
Due to the large number of wildlife along the Nolichucky River in Greene County, I feel those areas marked Zone 6 on the Nolichucky Reservoir Land Management Plan should at least be changed to a Zone 3. Several of the species we see are considered threatened and endangered. To proceed with	Individual

the Land Management Plan of providing campgrounds, boat ramps, beaches, etc. would destroy their natural habitat and all of it would soon be gone.	
TVA lands in and around the Nolichucky and Douglas Lake reservoirs should be used as conservation easements that will protect any wildlife there, but can be used for people to visit and enjoy.	Individual
My property fronts the Nolichucky River and Pigeon Creek in K-4 of reservoir map A-3. I am concerned that this section of the river is zoned 6. My concern is that further development in this area would have a negative effect on property values and wildlife habitat. There is also the question of public infrastructure available to handle additional traffic and activity. I'm particularly concerned about the viability of some county roads to handle additional traffic. I recognize the value of the river for public use but think it has greater value as zoned 3 and kept in a more natural state. Therefore I respectfully ask that you reconsider and change the zoning of this portion of the river to zone 3.	Individual
We are requesting a rezoning of A3 map property from zone 6 to zone 3 or 4 because: According to your own charts islands of less than 10 acres should be zone 4. Gray Island is less than 10 acres, so it should be at least a zone 4. The other island is obviously not 10 acres either. According to your own charts, land that includes wetlands, small wild areas and habitat protection should be zone 3. Gray Island is a rookery for the Great Blue Heron and contains many heron nest. The entire A3 area is a roosting and nesting area for the Black Vulture. This section of the Nolichucky contains a rare mussel that is only found here and near Chattanooga. The banks of the A3 area are home to two bat caves as well as many other wild animals including black bears, bobcats, red and silver foxes, white-tailed deer, and the recently introduced black tailed deer, etc.	Individuals (2)
I am writing regarding parcels 12 and 13 on the Nolichucky Reservoir. It is my understanding that these parcels are to be considered Zone 4. It is my suggestion that these parcels be rezoned to Zone 3 Sensitive Resource Management for several reasons. For a number of years, I have spent much time on the river near these parcels. In the recent past, I have begun to see otters, mink, beaver, and several species of birds at these areas. This May, I was on the river and became involved in a conversation with Jerry Denkins, a biologist from Knoxville. He stated that, in the span of a few minutes, he had seen five different species of swallow in this area. He commented on how unusual it is to see that many species of swallow in one area. There is also a spring on parcel 13 that flows year round. I feel that this should be protected from any sort of pollution or contamination, such as litter from people camping, hiking, or hunting in the area.	Individual
Rezoning on tiles A2 and A3 needs to be made, with considerations given to the endangered species of bats and vultures recently observed in shoreline caves, by contracting archeologists and biologists, from UT. What is now zoned for K5 and K6 needs to be changed to K4, to protect and conserve these species.	Individual
We feel the significant historical aspect of property along the Nolichucky River would be adversely affected if the proposed K3 through K13 properties are committed to zone 6. Being aware of the rich wildlife and history which surrounds these properties, we would ask the planning team to consider zoning these particular properties to zone 4 and maybe even zone 3. By keeping these properties in line with either of these two zones, we believe it would much better serve our farm and future endeavors into agricultural diversification as we	Individuals (2)

provide visitors with a cultural experience by keeping the natural and scenic areas along the river intact.	
---	--

Management of Land and Resources	
<b>Management by TWRA</b>	
Another concern that I have with the proposed TWRA involvement in river access comes from past experience. Not too long ago TWRA made an effort to increase public access to this section of the river by providing a graveled access area adjacent to the Earnest Bridge on TN Highway 351. After just a few years of availability to the public this access point was blocked off. It was my understanding that this was due to TWRA's inability to prevent vandalism, loitering and general misuse of the area by the general public. Has this issue been resolved? If so, what is the proposed solution to this issue and how is TWRA going to prevent this vandalism and misuse from spreading to private property along the river?	Individual
Given the choice between TVA and TWRA, we would prefer TVA as a neighbor.	Individuals (12)
Neither TVA nor TWRA have adequate budget to handle current demands and properly manage existing resources, yet you are proposing additional development that will cost taxpayers and ratepayers. Beyond that, the Nolichucky is presently "managed" just fine the way it is. Nolichucky property owners take good care and are stewards of the environment, and yet there is plentiful public access that is nowhere near any use capacity.	Individuals (2)
We would also like to know the purpose and the need TVA has for transferring this property to the TWRA. Have you received a description for TWRA's proposed use and action to be taken if they receive control of the property with their application? If so, we would like to see a copy of TWRA's application for the TVA property.	Individuals (2)
I strongly object to TWRA having any additional control anywhere along or adjacent to the river. Reasons: 1. TWRA introduced river otter and they have reduced the fish population and probably will destroy it in years to come. 2. TWRA introduced beaver and they have caused destruction that is already showing along the river. 3. Other TWRA failures include the introduction of coyotes in the area. This is a problem to wildlife and cattle farmers. They introduced wild turkeys and expanded the raccoon population. Both of these populations are exploding and are seriously damaging crops and gardens. 4. TWRA has done fish studies for many years on Douglas Lake and found the crappie population had been falling rapidly. The steps they took were pathetically too late to protect the crappie--they are about gone. No doubt TWRA has had successes and employ many good people. However, I am seriously asking TVA to save the Nolichucky River from the TWRA.	Individual
<b>Enforcement of Regulations and Policy</b>	
Who at TVA shall I contact should there be a problem? Who has jurisdiction on the water? How Many TWRA officials will be available to now operate as marine police? How many TWRA officials will be assigned to patrol specified areas designated for hunting? What controls will be placed to ensure regulations are met? Where will the funds originate for such demands?	Individual

If this plan proceeds and does indeed evolve, which agency, the TVA or the TWRA will police and enforce the protection of this great, mighty river?	Individual
One of the major access points used by the poachers in the past has been parcel 13 on Map (Tile) B7. I have personally intercepted a poacher entering my property after gaining access from the river from this same parcel. What is the proposed method to stop this illegal encroachment in the future?	Individual
I do not like the fact that cows from adjacent farms run and feed freely on the land in the reservoir, including the now land-bridged former islands in the middle of the lake. TDEC and the soil conservation folks make a big issue of fencing cattle out of the streams. Where does the TVA stand? Have these folks paid for grazing and water rights on this public land? Can I get permission to harvest a cow or two? If you were to open a season on these non-native species on public land I imagine the farmers would round them up and keep them on their land! Do you think some negative publicity would help resolve this matter?	Individual
What trash receptacles will be available and who will tend to taking off the waste? While there are many responsible citizens, it is no secret we remain a planet in turmoil when it comes to pollution. How will these particular sites be managed? What agency will work to prevent fires that might be caused by irresponsible individuals? Those individuals that feel now that they have access, they confuse their rights with what they have access to, what agency will redirect their footsteps?	Individual
What agency will be responsible for irresponsible hunters that miss their target and hit my home. What burden shall your agency carry should an innocent child be inflicted while playing on the river's edge from the miscalculation of a gun's crosshairs? What will isolate them to your tributary waters designated for hunting? What will prevent them from hunting from the river onto the land where innocent people living in their homes suffer the aftermath of such an event? Does your agency hold any responsibility based on the fact you are the vehicle to access? Who will oversee the regulations outlining the rules of hunting and fishing? The river has grown with residences and hunting on a 3 to 50 foot swath of land is frankly, nuts.	Individuals (2)
<b>Boundaries</b>	
I would like to suggest that boundary markers be put in place so that people would be less prone to claim land, harass people, and threaten people. I have spoken to people at TVA about boundary markers before. I am willing to donate some of my time and boat to help get this done. The markers could keep someone from getting into a squabble and possibly keep someone from getting injured over something we should all love and appreciate.	Individual
Take down the illegal "posted" signs, and clearly mark TVA owned land. I have seen several posted signs on land that I know is TVA land.	Individual
Who will locate the boundaries and mark them accordingly? What is legitimate? When the waters rise, how does this affect the boundaries? When the river floods and the banks change, who will inspect and be responsible for updating the boundaries and its public use?	Individual



Review and Planning Process	
<b>Agency Coordination</b>	
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs Land Management Plan by Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). At this time, the Forest Service does not have any specific comments as it pertains to scoping interest. However, the Cherokee National Forest would like to continue receiving notification of all documents and meetings as it pertains to this project, including the EIS when published.	USFS
Currently, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency manages the wildlife resources within the scope of this proposed project; including Rankin Bottom Wildlife Management Area and Henderson Island Refuge within the Douglas Reservoir lands, and the Nolichucky Waterfowl Sanctuary and Environmental Study Area (jointly managed by TWRA and TVA) within the Nolichucky Reservoir lands. We request that all alternatives discussed in the forthcoming EIS include a commitment that all lands currently committed to a specific use would be allocated to that current use. If a change is presented in the EIS that would affect currently committed lands, we request that a detailed description of why the change would be necessary and how this would affect the wildlife resources inhabiting the lands proposed for allocation under the new plan.	TWRA
The evaluation of proposed alternatives should clearly document all riverine, wetland, and upland habitats utilized by federally protected species, including migratory birds. The selection process for a preferred alternative should be consistent with previous commitments by TVA documented in the programmatic EIS for the Reservoirs Operations Study, obligations under TVA's Operations and Maintenance Biological Assessment and the Service's Biological Opinion, and recent policy changes governing TVA's stewardship of natural resources implemented by its Board of Directors.	USFWS
Typically, the Service would not concur with a "not likely to adversely affect" determination at the programmatic consultation level if that finding is based solely on a commitment to conduct site-specific consultations. If there is a potential for a "likely to adversely affect" determination to be made during site-specific consultations in the future, the Service advises that "likely to adversely affect" is the appropriate determination at the programmatic consultation level. A commitment by TVA to consult on site-specific projects that result from potential changes to existing land uses at Douglas Reservoir and Nolichucky Reservoir should be explicitly stated in environmental documentation for this project. If needed, these site-specific consultations can tier back to the programmatic consultation for this proposed EIS.	USFWS
The Office of Surface Mining's Appalachian Regional Office appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above proposed undertaking. However, as our area of interest is generally limited to the coalfield areas of the Appalachian region and these reservoirs lie well outside the coalfield area, we have no comments or concerns related to the development of the proposed NEPA document. We appreciate being given the opportunity to participate in this process. If at any time in the future you have questions or need additional information, please don't hesitate to contact us.	USOSM
Since your study would have no impact on any transportation facilities, we do not have any comments to offer at this time.	TDOT

<b>Alternatives</b>	
Have you looked at other alternatives, including a 'no action' alternative?	Individuals (2)
<b>Project Justification</b>	
I am writing to ask you to NOT go forth with the proposed changes in our Nolichucky River. There are several boat docks, and campgrounds that are not even fully utilized by the community. I know this because I am a camper at Kinser Park, full time, and see the lack of use. We as a county are so blessed by the beauty of our area, and want to share that beauty with future generations. If the breaks are not put on come of this; there will be none to see.	Individual
It would be smart for TVA and TWRA to simple back away and say "no" to this plan.	Individual
I was a bit upset reading the article in the Greeneville Sun about TVA's interference in local Nolichucky River land owner's rights. The economy is in the dumper, but somehow a bureaucratic nitwit is looking on how to spend taxpayer's money. It time to stop spending and start conserving, which is unheard of for the government!	Individual
I have not ruled out legal action on this invasion and will contact the Conservation Society and Sierra Club for advice and legal action. Wakeup! We do not need another government boondoggle! Save your money.	Individual
This plan is the most ill-conceived such project I have ever seen proposed by TVA and it has provoked what appears to be an increasing storm of regional concern, criticism and outright anger unlike any TVA project within my memory.	Individual

<b>Public Involvement</b>	
<b>Information, Materials , and Procedure</b>	
Maps and other presentation materials need to be current and complete. The two draft panels failed to reveal current and future sub-divisions. This is important to know. Also, drawing the map of 1007 lake levels is confusing. It makes some developed land appear to be islands and it would be helpful to have the water elevation noted on the map to help make sense of shoreline topography.	Individuals (2)
I thought the agenda of the public meeting was confusing at first until I studied it. I then realized that one could choose wither session as they are duplicated. The TVA staff members that we talked to were very knowledgeable representatives. In one situation, one employee did not know an answer to my question, he asked someone else to come over and answer it.	Individual
I appreciated the opportunity to learn more about this entire process. TVA had very caring and knowledgeable representatives. I think people would like to hear how they can become more involved. Any specific website navigation after TVA.gov? Are there any formed groups that people can join? Schedule of Board meetings (probably on website)?	Individual
Thank you for allowing the public to comment on the land management plan.	Individuals (2)

<p>The TVA representatives at the public meeting in Greeneville were not prepared to answer very many questions. It was not a productive meeting. They said they were expecting only one or two people to attend the meeting. The room was hot and about the size of two bedrooms and was standing room only, wall to wall. I was surprised and strongly disappointed that the moderator stated at least 4 or 5 times that public meetings were extremely expensive for TVA to conduct because of salaries and rent for facilities. How much does a public meeting cost? There are many public meeting sites for free such as schools, fire halls and courthouses. We, the citizens, own them. I was asked personally if I would work extra hours without extra pay. I was totally shocked at this question. In private industry that comes with the territory. I have worked as many as 90 hours per week without extra pay. I believe that TVA employees, top to bottom, are the best paid in the region, both in money and benefits. I would love to work for the TVA. Especially since TVA is in debt in the billions and raising costs to customers and still giving regular bonuses.</p>	Individuals (2)
<p>It is time TVA listens to the property owners who have been paying taxes all these years on their land instead of to special interest groups lobbying you to get access publicly to privately owned areas that they could not otherwise accomplish.</p>	Individual
<p>One last thing, Park Overall doesn't speak for me or for the majority of the people I know in Greene County. She may consider herself to be Greene County's environmental specialist, as noted in the Greeneville Sun, but she would never be elected if it was put to a vote.</p>	Individual
<p>Further, everyone that had attempted clarification via your website found no relief. Only one woman in Monday's impromptu and unofficial meeting was able to access the color codes. Your website maps are not readable and wildly dated.</p>	Individual
<p>TVA I support you and expect you will provide for the needs of the many. In time the complaints of the few will be forgotten as they also will see your wise use of our public land. Thank you, thank you, and thank you.</p>	Individual
<p>Being a neighbor of the Shady Grove Boat Ramp I appreciated the update and the position that your group has taken in ending the overnight camping. Since the ending of camping over night, the area is now cleaner, peaceful and somewhat tranquil, a park like environment now prevails, great job.</p>	Individual
<b>Notification</b>	
<p>I did not get enough information about this issue to make a comment. Also we did not receive a notice of a meeting.</p>	Individuals (3)
<p>TVA needs to mail a notice to every single land owner on the Nolichucky River. They have done it once before 4-5 years ago on the sediment plan. That is the deal in these federal things.</p>	Individual
<p>I, along with the other attendees from Greene County, found it highly suspicious that most of the landowners affected by this were not informed of this action and are against an arbitrary deadline to make a public statement and response against this action. The rights of private landowners seem to have been violated. I only received notice three days ago in the Saturday Greeneville Sun Newspaper and from other very concerned landowners. The notice in the Greeneville Sun did not show a map so I would have had no manner of knowing you are claiming to own property I bought and paid for legally. No Phone calls,</p>	Individuals (17)

no mail informative pieces, nor anyone contacting us personally as they surveyed our land. The vagueness in the paper stating "stakeholders" vs. land owners, without roads or clear border lines, without notifying anyone actually involved in this land acquisition surely must break come written legal lines.	
The stakeholders along the Nolichucky River were not given legal notice by TVA. Federal rules require the public notice be run 2 times in a 4 week period in a local paper. The Greeneville Sun has informed us that they ran a single small notice, June 5, oddly entitled, FYI From TVA. This is not standard format and not appropriate notice. One time is legally inadequate. I, personally, asked the Greeneville Sun to alert people that there would be a meeting with a rep of TVA at the soil conservation office in Greeneville on Monday, June 30. The paper obliged and over 30 people showed up at yesterday's unofficial meeting, More than showed up at TVA's official meeting in Morristown. No one in that room had received a mailing from TVA. Nor was anyone aware of the FYI notice except for one woman who misunderstood which notice was official. No stakeholder in the room was aware of your alleged notice. Your Chris Cooper admitted at this surprise gathering, Monday that a TVA secretary made the egregious error and she has since retired. That is none of our affair. Appalachian stakeholders require the same legal standard as anyone else, and in this instance we were clearly left out of the legal loop.	Individual
<b>Extension of Comment Period</b>	
I saw the notice in the Greeneville Sun on 7/01/2008, with a statement that the deadline for comments. I am sure that a lot of individuals will not be able to respond to this notice due to failure of seeing the article in time and the absence of email capability.	Individual
I am very concerned with the actions of the TVA in this matter. The lack of notice to private land owners and the neglect or consideration of environment impact leads me to believe a suspension of action is in order until more information can be gathered by the public and private land owners. The public deserves the opportunity to evaluate the environmental and economic impact of this action. I am requesting a stay for all actions and an extension of the comment period.	Individuals (9)
It is offensive to the citizens and property owners that consideration for another "public meeting" has been denied. According to your representative, much emphasis was placed on the costs of holding such a meeting. Had your agency properly notified the public, perhaps such a request would not have been necessary. Taking responsibility for this insufficient notice by your 'authority' is imperative to our community in an effort to show good faith. As Chris Cooper, attempted to address the rumor that this is a "done deal"...the community and property owners sit wondering what the deal really is. The origination of faith...the lack of proper notice. The denial of an extension of the comment period. In closing, I must admit that I could write a dissertation that is worthy for the cause is great. But since the deadline is midnight tonight, I recognize the criticality in submitting my comments immediately as I fear they will not reach you.	Individual
I strongly request a reasonable extension of the public comment period because of the inadequacy and illegality of your organization's notice to people of this community. Further, to ask mountain people to drive to Morristown for a case by case meeting is not only appalling but unacceptable. Have you people noticed the price of gas? If you have such limited resources that you cannot	Individual

properly notice the public or come to the affected communities, please know that most mountain people have less money than TVA. This request to have us come to you is a mockery of federal law and an excessively unreasonable drain on the stakeholders. TVA continues to show a lack of interest or understanding of the people in these mountain communities. A region you claim to serve.	
An Environmental Impact Statement was initiated nine months ago. We have great interest in the findings of this study and any decisions should be shelved until the completion	Individual
<b>Add to Mailing List</b>	
I wish to be added to your mailing list for the Douglas-Nolichucky Tributary Land Management Plan.	Individuals (25)

<b>Stewardship of Public Lands</b>	
<b>Public Ownership</b>	
As a member of Forestwatch our research, which is extensive, has found that the best stewards of an area are the owners. The worst at the government and corporations. I am happy to forward our data.	Individual
TVA managed public lands along the reservoirs and rivers should not be sold to private individuals, corporations or speculators. I've see this happen on The Little Tennessee River (now Tellico Lake), and on Douglas and Cherokee Lakes. The result is that the privileged few get to enjoy the lake and riversides and limit access to what was once everybody's to use and enjoy. I am submitting this in the honor and memory of a dear friend who introduced me to fishing, swimming, canoeing, and camping on the Nolichucky River and Douglas Lake nearly fifty years ago. I would hate to see our children and grandchildren deprived of privileges that I had. I think public use lands are great and I support your ideas.	Individuals (2)
I also fear that TVA may for profit or under pressure from the affluent landowners adjoining the TVA lands "cash in" our public lands along the river and lake by selling TVA managed land to the private landowners and speculators.	Individuals (2)
I feel that opening the Nolichucky as well as other areas up to general public would not be good. There are boat ramps and etc where boater can dock and put their boat in and several of these I think. We do not fish or boat on the river either – really do not have time – but if we did – we could find proper areas to put our boats in. It is very important for owners that join the river to continue to have privacy as well as the river to not be trashed any more than it is.	Individual
We feel that the "optimum public benefit" would be the preservation of a little slice of nature that is already suffering from the public assess that already exists, i.e. an ill placed campfire destroyed a large tree on TVA land in this area on the night of June 19, 2008.	Individuals (2)
<b>Public Use of Public Land</b>	
We enjoy outdoor recreation and we greatly appreciate all opportunities to enjoy our publicly owned lands and waters. Please do not let self-centered private land owners prevent us all from enjoying our natural resources.	Individuals (2)

I “support” the proposal to open up access to the Nolichucky River in the Greene county area for more public use. With the rising price of fuel and other items, many families will be unable to travel very far to enjoy a vacation. With the river land open for public use many of them will be able to go there and enjoy the scenic river. Hopefully there can also be some campsites set up to accommodate campers.	Individual
<b>TVA Stewardship</b>	
I hope that TVA is not intimidated by 35 selfish property owners who want to block/prevent the General Public from being able to use Government Owned land, and enjoy the benefits of picnic and relaxation areas along the Nolichucky River. This is not their (35) personal river. This river belongs to the government, We the People. Please proceed with your plan to open up these areas for general public use.	Individual
I believe require that the property remain a TVA possession which should be unchanged: 1. This area of the Nolichucky River still is home to several family farms which hold great significance to Greene County which could be diminished if TWRA turns this into a recreation area. 2. The roads, specifically pumpkin bloom road is to small to handle an increase in traffic. 3. The cliffs at parcels K5 and K6 would be extremely dangerous.	Individual
I actually think there are some areas that used to be islands that are now land bridged that would make great areas if timber were cleared off for food plots for deer, duck and turkeys all up and down the river. Some of it is TVA owned and some of them might be able to be leased for those kinds of purposes. I know that some floods enough that it is not really useable as agricultural lands.	Individual
TVA land should be open to the public with an effective plan to keep the areas trash free.	Individual
Please don't allow the river to be trampled by hunters, fisherman and birdwatchers. They won't stay on public lands...They will trample private land as well	Individual
I'd like to see the river developed for recreation between Brown's Bridge and the dam especially the wetland areas. Obviously more points of access are needed. How about an upscale restaurant/bar in the power house?	Individual

<b>Natural Resources</b>	
<b>Threatened and Endangered Species</b>	
Which agency will be responsible for patrolling and ensuring the safety of existing habitat? What funds will be allocated to properly protect these sacred waters and the rare species of those gently creatures? Since the sensitivity of their existence is held classified in many cases, In the past, citizens have relied on you to protect. How will this be delegated? Should I consider taking down my wood duck boxes that have provided a safe refuge for them to produce? If not, then what agency will protect them from invasion of lost hunters?	Individual
According to our records, the federally endangered gray bat ( <i>myotis grisescens</i> ), Indiana bat ( <i>Myotis sodalis</i> ), oyster mussel ( <i>Epioblasma capsaeformis</i> ), and the federally threatened snail darter ( <i>Percina tanasi</i> ) may occur in the project impact area. Qualified biologists should evaluate the potential for each alternative to	USFWS

affect these species. Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, a programmatic level consultation on the identified preferred alternative for the proposed Douglas and Nolichucky Reservoirs Land Plan is needed.	
It is incumbent upon both of our agencies to coordinate adequately in the future so as to minimize the likelihood of any specific actions resulting in an adverse effect to listed species. These constitute the comments of the U.S. Department of the Interior in accordance with provisions of the Endangered Species Act (87 Stat. 884, as amended: 16 U.S.C. 1513 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-711), and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 61 et seq.).	USFWS
If it is illegal to shoot a black Vulture then isn't it against the Federal Wildlife Protection Act to destroy their nesting habitat? Isn't there some law that prevents the destruction of a bird rookery? Why would TVA want to do such a thing?	Individuals (2)
The endangered fresh water mussel located in the swift waters near the Allens Bridge, (tile A3), by biologists contracted by the TDOT in 2005, deserves to be protected, not only from heavy silt produced during sand dredging operations, but also, from water turbulence produced by air boats and outboard motorboats. I suggest, airboats and gasoline motorboats be prohibited from use, in an area starting at the Kinser bridge to the bridge crossing Hwy 321, in Greene county. (Tiles A2 thru A3). Rezoning to a zone 4 would accomplish this protection. Canoes, kayaks and perhaps boats with electric motors would be OK in this area.	Individual
Several of the species we see are considered threatened and endangered. To proceed with the Land Management Plan of providing campgrounds, boat ramps, beaches, etc. would destroy their natural habitat and all of it would soon be gone.	Individual
A protected bat cave will be a target for the public crawling all over the wonderful area.	Individual
<b>Aquatic Ecology</b>	
Fishing in the river has been hurt since the dam was constructed across the river at Lowland. Can this dam be removed?	Individual
I am interested in a clean river where I can fish.	Individual
<b>Terrestrial Ecology</b>	
Before this decision is made, we are asking that you conduct enough studies and investigation to make an informed decision. We believe and are requesting that these studies include the following: A baseline survey during all seasons of the year; Nesting and habitat study be conducted in all seasons of the year for migratory birds and Black Vultures to ensure that your decision compiles with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the protected status of the Black Vulture; A study of the air quality, water quality and noise pollution to show the impact that your decision will have on all wildlife.	Individuals (2)
Roads expanded, wildlife restricted and harmed and relocating elsewhere; expense of protecting our land boundaries; infringement on our privacy; opening up a quiet/peaceful environment; dangers of boating in shallow rivers; no policing and on and on for generations to come. No, we do not want our river and natural habitat destroyed. I have many photos if you like to see, of the great-blue and blue-Heron, several nests across the river of Heron and Vulture, Osprey, white-tail and black-tail deer, red fox, the American Kestrel and other Hawks, beavers, beautiful Kingfisher birds and even nests of skunks and raccoons.	Individuals (2)

The area that I live on is Cane Island, (B-7). There are two nests of Great Blue Herons there and a family of River Otters that stay on island. In the winter Great Canadian Geese stay on Cane Island as they don't feel threatened by river traffic. I believe this area should be sanctioned as a bird wildlife preserve. I have pictures of these rookeries. Traffic in this area would drive off the Herons. There is also a nest of egrets. An Osprey also roosts a half mile up from this island. The development of this area will greatly affect the environment and destroy this natural wildlife area. If you need proof call me and I'll be happy to show you this area.	Individual
Near the convergence of Horse Creek and the Nolichucky River in Greene County is home to many types of wildlife including many species of Sparrows and sensitive wetland species that deserve protection.	Individual
<b>Trash and Litter</b>	
There is litter, old tires, and other debris in and around the river. We don't want increased land/water use to add to the problem. Work has been done to improve the situation, and it would be great to continue in that direction, cleaning up and putting public land/water to good use. Please only recommend uses that have a low impact, (such as hiking, primitive camping, canoeing, and kayaking) in environmentally sensitive areas! We don't need motorboats, jet skis, or other polluters in the Nolichucky River. We also don't need overly developed tourist attractions that require large buildings and paved parking lots. We need to preserve the beauty of the land/water in its natural state, to the greatest extent possible!	Individual
I would like to say that I am a hunter, fisherman, and I love spending time with nature. Although I hunt and fish I do not drink beer or liquor. I do not throw down beer cans or soft drink cans, I do not throw down trash on land or water. I do however pick up trash on the river banks and from the water. I have carried many bags of trash from the Nolichucky River and from around the area where I duck hunt.	Individual
I am the person who first raised the tires issue last spring and was very pleased that the tires were removed. My interest is in seeing that the remaining tires are taken out of the river and disposed of properly.	Individuals (2)
<b>Water Quality</b>	
Water quality downstream of dredging operations is deplorable. Three days are required for the water to clear silt content, after dredging operations are discontinued. All forms of wildlife, including endangered fresh water mussels, suffer as a result from this contamination. Policies need to be developed, to prevent water contamination caused by sand dredging on the Nolichucky River.	Individual
This river provides the most of the water that Greene County residents drink. Maintaining good water quality is utmost in sustaining good health to both humans and wildlife including some endangered species.	Individual
I live in the Greeneville area and am particularly interested in the Nolichucky Reservoir and followed the situation regarding the siltation and my belief is that the Nolichucky Reservoir will be a silt retention pond for Douglas Lake and eventually become a big wetland with a river channel running through it. It's close to that now.	Individual
The Nolichucky is this area's drinking water supply. There is one Federal superfund site upstream, Bumpass Cove. There are 2 state superfund sites, both	Individual



on the river, and both in Erwin. All approx. 30 river miles from our drinking water intake. Nuclear Fuels Service is a notorious nuclear fuels facility, known nationwide for its multiple and murderous mistakes. Then From Erwin to Greeneville on the river it is entirely agriculture for 30 miles, another major source of pollution. So, we have pesticides on top of NFS's 50 year history of illegal dumping into the river, as well as the air, and 2 state superfunds. NFS just lost a federal lawsuit for seriously polluting its corporate neighbor. My neighbors on both sides of my properties have cows with unlimited access to the river. This is true on the whole stretch of our river.	
We believe TVA's proposed action plan to be a threat to the quality of the water of the Nolichucky River. This plan will increase the chances of the river's water being polluted and trashed by public traffic and campsite usage. The possibility of campers dumping their waste water into the river is a tremendous concern, as well as regular trash (paper, plastic etc.). This action plan is not environmentally friendly and points more to a future disaster waiting to happen.	Individuals (4)
If campgrounds are developed, where will the campers dispose of their waste since septic systems are illegal on the river? Pollution to our drinking water? Human waste?	Individual
I am having difficulty understanding how recreational use of the Nolichucky River is going to aid any in sediment control. In fact, it seems that such use would only serve to restrict the possibility for silt retrieval and thereby undermine what initially was a major goal that began this whole review process.	Individual
Although the river is a major source of water for the animals, there is a spring on parcel 13 that I assume of much this wildlife can use if needed. Considering the droughts we have had over the past years, it seems any source of fresh water should be protected from contaminations that humans tend to create and kept as pure as possible for any wildlife that may need to use it.	Individual
<b>Wetlands</b>	
The wetland areas are beautiful and helpful, and should be enhanced to make them bigger and better, our county should be proud of the Nolichucky River and its wetland systems.	Individuals (3)
A TVA wetland specialist stated that the wetlands above the Dam were the finest in the seven state TVA area. These definitely need special protection but they also need to be used for environmental education.	Individual
<b>Wildlife and Conservation</b>	
The next issue that concerns me is the affect of increased river traffic on the wildlife in and along the river. I have noticed an increase in wildlife numbers both in species and population in the past 15 years. In my humble and uneducated opinion this is due mostly to the homeostasis that has been reached in regard to the wildlife's acceptance of what human pressure is exerted at present. Will this balance be tipped in the wrong direction with increased activity?	Individual
I am concerned about the impact these proposals will have specifically on the natural habitat.	Individual
We are extremely concerned that any development of recreational facilities and/or boat launches will ruin the wildlife habitat along the river. Currently, there are many different kinds of wildlife that enjoy the peace and quiet along the river: osprey, red tailed hawks, beaver, river otter, raccoons, deer, blue heron, black	Individuals (3)

vultures, kingfisher, and even eagles. The river is not deep enough for motor boats in this section of the river (thank goodness) and the wildlife thrives. There is a cave down river from us that has a bat habitat. What will happen if the public is allowed to roam these shores freely? The animals will have to find another home and for what?	
It is my feeling that one of the most important things TVA can do with the Nolichucky River, and Douglas Lake, is manage as intensively as possible for wildlife and wildlife habitat, particularly waterfowl. There is untold potential, especially above Bird's Bridge.	Individual
This plan would have a very big negative environmental impact to the extreme variety of wildlife bordering my property from West Allen's Bridge to Gray Road to Pumpkin Bloom Lane. It was news to me of the two of three bat caves. A protected Bat Cave will be a target for the public crawling all over this wonderful area. However, my wife is a photographer who has shared many photos of her deer, red fox, herons (attached newest three in a nest), vultures, ,bobcats to name a few. There are at least 20 Heron nests along the river – we have seen and witnessed some, as have others. Their young will return to this area. A bird sanctuary should be established for this Zone. The character and landscape of the area, with the smoky mountain backdrop is incomparable. It is said we have the best wetlands in the 7 states region.	Individual
In the article of the Greeneville Sun, the reporter mentioned bird watching. If people are allowed to come freely on the shores of the Nolichucky, the birds will leave for quieter havens. Bird watchers don't normally invest in boats just for that purpose.	Individuals (2)
Zone 4 – Natural Resource Conservation areas need to be kept natural and protected with little to no public access from the land.	Individual
My suggestion is that, the lake and adjacent tenable properties should be actively managed for water fowl habitat and the reservoir ought to be opened up to limited hunting instead of a closed waterfowl sanctuary especially in light of what TWRA is doing with Ducks Unlimited in the Lick Creek Management area.	Individual
Habitat protection areas and river corridor sensitive resources needs protection.	Individual
There are numerous river bottoms that would make great wildlife plots for deer, turkey, and waterfowl. I have planted several acres myself in the past. There are many locations for seasonal waterfowl impoundments, etc. For example, Rankin Bottom should be actively managed for waterfowl. Mark the no shooting zones. I know areas where houses are close enough to the river that waterfowlers who are float hunting would be in violation of the law if they shot at a duck, but the houses aren't necessarily easy to see from the river due to foliage and elevations. There also used to be a sign protecting the slough at Kinser Park. Most people don't realize it is supposed to be a no shooting zone.	Individual
Since TWRA and Ducks Unlimited have started the project at Lick Creek, which will include a large waterfowl sanctuary area, I would like to see the section between Bird's Bridge and the Dam opened to limited waterfowl hunting, perhaps 2 days per week during the regular waterfowl season.	Individual

<b>Cultural Resources</b>	
<b>Visual</b>	
The beauty of this place will be lost with overdevelopment. There is a painting of the Nolichucky Cliffs that has hung in a special place in the entry hall of the Governor's Mansion (now the "Tennessee Residence") in Nashville for years.	Individual
<b>Archeology</b>	
Another issue is the possible existence of a Native American burial mound on parcel 13, and a small wetland habitat. These would seem to be resources that should be protected, thus earning this particular area a zone 3 status.	Individual
This river valley was home to Native Americans including the Woodland Indians. The largest village site (above the Dam) was excavated in the 1950's and taken to the McClung Museum at the University of Tennessee for protection and display. There are other sites with artifacts along the river that need protection. These places should not be publicized. Who will protect them?	Individual
<b>Historical</b>	
I am a riverfront property owner on the Nolichucky River on the south side of the river directly across from Pigeon Creek and downstream. My great grandfather owned this land since before the Civil War and my farm has since been designated as a Century Farm.	Individual
My family has lived on the Nolichucky River (Mile 66-67) since 1777 when two land grants were obtained by Henry Earnest for his service in the American Revolution. I am the seventh generation to live here. The family history and my life are intertwined with the river and land. Stories of the river, the normal flow, the floods, the changes are part of our family history. The land along the river from mile marker 65 and ½ through 68 on the south side of the river is on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as the Earnest Family Farms and the Mauris Earnest Fort House on the north side is also on the NRHP as a separate listing. This area is close to the Davy Crockett Birthplace State Park.	Individual
My question is about a rumor that TVA had purchased a tract of land including 2525 Sunnyside Rd, and that the 1800's brick home that stands there was going to be torn down. We don't want to see a part of the county's history destroyed.	Individual
Our farm has been in my husband's family for 150 years, and in order to maintain a viable income for ourselves and to preserve this land for our sixth generation granddaughter, we are encouraged to develop the potential of our farm to host visitors interested in our agricultural heritage through agritourism.	Individuals (2)
I would like to have the Nolichucky River meet the standards for a National Scenic River and for TVA to have a role in making this happen.	Individual

<b>Recreation</b>	
<b>Campgrounds</b>	
My family loves to camp on the river, but we don't know if we can legally camp anywhere, except a public campground surrounded by other campers. My family is environmentally conscious, we don't litter – we collect others' litter, we go to the river to enjoy the wildlife and the outdoors – not the company of other	Individual

campers, we obey the TWRA laws as best as we can understand them ( we don't trout fish any more, too hard to understand different rules, different streams, sections of streams, etc).	
Overnight camping should not be allowed unless there is an effective plant to maintain the area trash free.	Individual
I'm interested in properties suitable for campground, restaurant, wedding facility with banquets, and full service marina/boat rental. Something similar to the Dandridge, the Point property except public access/use and not private property sales such as point group is planning.	Individual
Campers on TVA managed land should have clear cut publicly announced and posted laws to protect the land owners adjacent to TVA land. TVA land should be clearly identified for those using the river and land for recreational purposes.	Individuals (2)
Any land use that makes room for community recreation is wonderful use of public land. We need this recreation to involve our children in activities that help keep them out of trouble. It is good for local economy as well. Recreation is tough to afford with the cost of travel. Every day our cost of living is spiraling up and any recreation close to home is needed and appreciated.	Individual
Install a few picnic tables in the Shady Grove Boat Ramp Park similar to what TVA has done at the Douglas Dam camp ground, an outstanding well maintained facility. Concrete tables and benches on a concrete pad, they will not float away and cannot be stolen, no maintenance, best of the best, like the people at TVA. This is still an active swimming area.	Individual
Consider contacting Glen Bibbins, the President of LOUD, to organize a cleanup group to care for what the campers have left behind at the Shady Grove Boat Ramp Park, especially the old camp fire sites. I have talked to Glen and he is amenable to this action.	Individual
<b>Water Use</b>	
The bass fishing can be done anywhere along the river – it isn't any better along our narrow portion of the river than it is anywhere else. Let us preserve the natural habitat along a little bit of the river so the amazing animals will continue to have a home.	Individual
Developed recreation should be limited. Too much recreation can over populate the river and decrease the quality of the water and endanger the wildlife. "Chucky Beach", an area used by the public as a party place, existed across the river from my property during the 1940-80's. Many people enjoyed the sandy beach and access to the water where they could use canoes and tubes. The negative effects are trash, noise at all hours of the day and night, lack of public restrooms, the firing of guns into the cliffs on my side the river, people drowning in the river. The property owners finally gave up trying to keep a nice recreational area nor could they continue to accept the liability. They sold the land and the new owners fenced off the beach to be used only by wildlife. Greenways and Blue ways-The Greeneville-Greene County Partnership is working on a long range plan to develop a greenway from Greeneville to, Kinser Park and later from Davy Crockett Birthplace State Park to Kinser Park. A Blue way could also be developed in the river. This endeavor takes years of discussions and planning and agreements by the affected land owners. Are the citizens and land owners ready for these recreation activities and the problems they bring?	Individual

I and many others would like to see the Nolichucky restricted from the use of any gasoline engines on boats or electric generators directly on the river.	Individual
<b>Public Safety</b>	
I am concerned about the placing of a public area down stream of the dam. The portion of the river between there and Allens Bridge is extremely dangerous because of all the hidden shoals and rocks. Nearly every 3 years come group drowns there and that is with minimal usage. Increased usage will mean more loss of life	Individual
As stated in a public meeting, there are many boat docks already available. In addition to being shallow waters, where locals will not even venture in for the undercurrents, I feel that safety is an issue of real concern.	Individual

<b>Socioeconomic</b>	
The Nolichucky View golf Club is interested in exploring the possibility of using the lower southwest portion of Parcel #3 at the Nolichucky Dam as a driving range for our golf course. How do we proceed with this request? Is it a possibility? Please provide direction. This would be a Zone 6 project. Presently being mowed for hay. Parcel 3 is maybe 15 acres of flat open land at present. The only thing we would do, would be to keep it mowed and maybe put up some rope dividers for a tee area.	Individual
I would like to see the Nolichucky Dam and Power House be transformed into money making educational facility for Greeneville and surrounding area. First of all would be to construct a building next to the existing power plant building. This building would be a museum/learning facility with displays of the early electrical generation equipment, the history of TVA and REA along with displays of Thomas Edison, George Westinghouse, Tesla, and other people who developed the electrical industry. The generators and turbines that exist now in the powerhouse would be removed and placed for viewing in the in the museum and new generators and turbines installed to generate power for the City of Greeneville to help with costs of running a city and cover the expenses of maintaining the museum plus lowering or keeping the tax rate in check and a few more jobs for local citizens. By installing new generators and turbines in the existing facility we would be cutting the need for many barrels of oil and tons of coal.	Individuals (2)
Only two sand companies exist as industries on the river. To keep this area natural and beautiful there should be no additional industries except agriculture on this small river in Greene County and definitely no business parks.	Individual

During one of these meetings an individual had reported to the public forum they had traveled down the Nolichucky River from Davey Crockett State park to the dam and had saw no businesses along that route. This observation was incorrect. Our family operates a sand and gravel business on River Mile 61 near Kinser Bridge. We have Storm water permits through the Department of Environment and Conservation that allow for excavation activities within our levy system. We also have been permitted in the past for dredging and pumping of sand from the Nolichucky River at river, mile marker 61. We continue to maintain our water pumping and screening equipment for the day that we need to move our excavation activities from the earth levies and return to the river itself.	Individual
The Native Americans and later settlers recognized the area for the rich soil to grow food, clean water for fishing, and ample woodlands for hunting wild game. Various kinds of farming provided the primary income as this is very fine, old soil that washed down from the mountains to the river bottoms over thousands of years. We have not seen many changes in growth near the river because the people have been able to maintain a way of life in a very beautiful place.	Individual
This area of Appalachia is recognized as one of three "hot spots" in the country for high cancer rates for certain types of cancer. We have to ask questions, why? Is there something in the water? In the air? What is causing the problem? Do we need to add additional unnecessary stresses through development and over use of the river before these problems are solved?	Individual
This river cannot withhold anymore industrial impact. If TVA cannot control cows in the river, how is TVA to control industry with TVA's current lack of funding? Why would TVA even suggest industry on such a highly impacted and fragile small river?	Individual

Douglas Reservoir	
<b>Lake levels</b>	
It's hard to understand sometimes the water levels on Douglas Lake. I have land adjoining the lake here. I have noticed in the last week where Douglas Lake has been unchanged and several of the other lakes are still raising theirs. I know this has been a question probably before. This concerns a lot of the people that live on the lake the way they raise and lower the lake. It would be a great help to get more water in the lake and keep it at an even space and keep it high enough so it could be used until October.	Individual
Lake levels should be as high as possible all year to maximize recreational and quality of life issues.	Individual
I was hoping that there would be some encouraging work towards maintaining good water levels in Douglas Lake, but I guess it really depends on God sending the rain.	Individual

Other	
Public interest in recreation living is understandable, and we're among those who enjoy a home on Douglas Lake. What concerns us is the increase in RV parks and campgrounds and the danger they pose to water quality. We appreciate the demand on leases and permits for this purpose. But unless restrictions, protections, etc are in rock solid place, we worry about the long term state of Douglas Lake being compromised. Permanently compromised.	Individuals (2)
High winds blow up tall dust clouds from the lake bed, especially during fall and winter.	Individual
The Douglas Lake area does need cleaning up from all the recreational trash. Don't send it up river.	Individual

## Part II:

### Public Comments Identified for Nolichucky Reservoir Parcels

(No parcels were identified for Douglas Reservoir)

Nolichucky Reservoir		
Parcel	Suggested Land Use	Comment
K3-K6	Zone 3 or 4	Again, we want to express our input that the areas K3-K6 be changed to zone 3 or 4 instead of 6 for the following reasons: 1. There is a cave which opens over the river on parcel K5. This cave houses thousands of bats which would be disturbed were this area to be used as recreation. 2. American Black Vultures roost all along parcels K5 and K6 daily and have nest down river. 3. Numerous Blue Herron nest are on the island designated as K5. This island is less than 10 acres, so it should ,by your own guidelines, be classified as Zone 4, notwithstanding the habitat of the Blue Herron and other native creatures. Let's protect our natural habitat along the river and in 100 years we will be able to look back and say we did the right thing.
Convergence of Horse Creek and Nolichucky River	Zone 3	As a concerned citizen, I feel the land management plan for the Nolichucky Reservoir should be modified near the convergence of Horse Creek and the Nolichucky River in Greene County and coded as Sensitive Resource Management (Zone 3) because: 1) The Nolichucky Watershed/Green County needs better protected resources. 2) In this specific area, the southern banks of the Nolichucky are home to many types of wildlife including many species of Sparrows and sensitive wetland species that deserve protection. 3) Usage in this area should be limited to prevent erosion, run-off, and water quality issues on the Nolichucky. Please consider rezoning the area of the Nolichucky River between Highway 351 and 107 to reflect the proper Land Management Plan needed for the flora and fauna in the local habitat.



Map A3	Zone 3 or 4	<p>We are requesting a rezoning of A3 map property from zone 6 to zone 3 or 4 because: According to your own charts islands of less than 10 acres should be zone 4. Gray Island is less than 10 acres, so it should be at least a zone 4. The other island is obviously not 10 acres either. According to your own charts, land that includes wetlands, small wild areas and habitat protection should be zone 3. Gray Island is a rookery for the Great Blue Heron and contains many heron nest. The entire A3 area is a roosting and nesting area for the Black Vulture. This section of the Nolichucky contains a rare mussel that is only found here and near Chattanooga. The banks of the A3 area are home to two bat caves as well as many other wild animals including black bears, bobcats, red and silver foxes, white-tailed deer, and the recently introduced black tailed deer, etc.</p>
12 and 13	Zone 3	<p>I am writing regarding parcels 12 and 13 on the Nolichucky Reservoir. It is my understanding that these parcels are to be considered Zone 4. It is my suggestion that these parcels be rezoned to Zone 3 Sensitive Resource Management for several reasons. For a number of years, I have spent much time on the river near these parcels. In the recent past, I have begun to see otters, mink, beaver, and several species of birds at these areas. This May, I was on the river and became involved in a conversation with Jerry Denkins, a biologist from Knoxville. He stated that, in the span of a few minutes, he had seen five different species of swallow in this area. He commented on how unusual it is to see that many species of swallow in one area. There is also a spring on parcel 13 that flows year round. I feel that this should be protected from any sort of pollution or contamination, such as litter from people camping, hiking, or hunting in the area.</p>
K3-K13	Zone 3 or 4	<p>We feel the significant historical aspect of property along the Nolichucky River would be adversely affected if the proposed K3 through K13 properties are committed to zone 6. Being aware of the rich wildlife and history which surrounds these properties, we would ask the planning team to consider zoning these particular properties to zone 4 and maybe even zone 3. By keeping these properties in line with either of these two zones, we believe it would much better serve our farm and future endeavors into agricultural diversification as we provide visitors with a cultural experience by keeping the natural and scenic areas along the river intact.</p>